

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the courtesy of the Examiner for granting a telephone interview on April 22, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the prior art of record does not disclose the features of claims 1 and 7, but further consideration is required, as described in the Examiner's Interview Summary.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11 and 15-25 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-10 and 12-14 have been cancelled. New claims 24 and 25 have been added.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15-16, 18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Jensen, Frelechoux et al. and Alexander et al. Claim 1 recites features, however, which are neither disclosed or suggested by the prior art, namely,

... wherein the second router device is a mobile router device newly connected to the local network, and the first router device sends the information to the second router device based on the request by the second router device.

As described above, the Examiner agreed that the prior art of record does not disclose the features of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 4, 16 and 20-21 ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4, 16 and 20-21 are likewise allowable over the art of record.

As described above, the Examiner also agreed that the prior art of record does not disclose the features of claim 7. Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 7 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 11, 15, 18 and 22-23 ultimately depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 11, 15, 18 and 22-23 are likewise allowable over the art of record.

Claims 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Jensen, Frelechoux et al., Alexander et al. and Kuo et al. Claims 17 and 19 are allowable, however, because they depend from allowable claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17 and 19 be withdrawn.

New claims 24 and 25 have been added. Basis for new claims 24 and 25 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 15, lines 5-10. No new matter has been added.

Appln. No.: 10/531,888  
Amendment Dated May 23, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of April 1, 2008

MAT-8683US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/nm

Dated: May 23, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM271807